

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,079	12/09/2003	Masayuki Ikeno	246483US0	2768
22850 7	7590 07/19/2005		EXAM	INER
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			ZIMMER, MARC S	
	A, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1712	
			DATE MAILED: 07/19/200:	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		μ			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commence	10/730,079	IKENO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Marc S. Zimmer	1712			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	·				
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2005. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-12 is/are pending in the appr 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-9 and 12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the open control of the open c	epted or b) objected to by the for drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/730,079

Art Unit: 1712

Based on an indication of allowable subject matter in claim 5, Applicant has amended the base claim to include the subject matter recited in claim 5. It is now appreciated that the Examiner erred by stating that claim 5 was not rendered obvious by the combination set out previously. Any inconvenience to Applicant is sincerely regretted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haselhorst et al., U.S. patent # 6,300,455 in view of Hatanaka et al., U.S. Patent # 4,329,275. Based on the structure of the compounds corresponding to component (B) that are outlined in column 3, lines 8-10, it is now the position of the Examiner that the newly added limitation, i.e. that of original claim 5, is inherently satisfied.

Section 2112.01 of the MPEP emphasizes that, "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). "Whether the rejection is based on inherency under 35 U.S.C. 102, on prima facie obviousness' under 35 U.S.C. 103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same...[footnote omitted]." The burden of proof is

Application/Control Number: 10/730,079

Art Unit: 1712

similar to that required with respect to product-by-process claims. *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F. 2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA 1980) (quoting *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433-34 (CCPA 1977)). However, "A prima facie case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product." *In re Best*, 562 F.2d at 1255, 195 USPQ at 433.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Haselhorst et al., U.S. patent # 6,300,455 and Hatanaka et al., U.S. Patent # 4,329,275

as applied to claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12 and further in view of a formula taken from

Silicones, An Introduction to Their Chemistry and Applications authored by Freeman

that relates polymer chain length and viscosity and the definitions of dynamic and
kinematic viscosity delineated by Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary for the
same reason provided previously.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10 and 11 remain objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc S. Zimmer whose telephone number is 571-272-1096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1712

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

July 16, 2005

Marc Zimmer AU 1714